

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 2-5, 7 and 9 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 10-13 have been added. Thus, claims 1, 6, 8 and 10-13 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 6 and 8 are independent.

Noted - Priority Document Received By USPTO

The indication (see previously issued Office Action dated December 9, 2008, Office Action Summary, box 12(a)(1) as checked) that the certified copy(ies) of the priority document(s) has been received by the USPTO is noted with appreciation.

Noted - IDS Considered

The indication (see the attachment to the previously issued Office Action dated December 9, 2008) that the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) as filed on 02/26/2004 and references listed therein have been considered is noted with appreciation.

Noted - Drawings Approved

The indication (see previously issued Office Action dated December 9, 2008, Office Action Summary, box 10(a) as checked) that the Drawings (submitted on February 26, 2004) have been approved is noted with appreciation.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action states that "a hardware controller that includes..." is not described in the specification as written. By the foregoing amendments, claim 1 has been amended to change the term "a hardware

controller” to the term --a processor--. The processor recited in claim 1 has been supported by the present specification, page 12, line 28 to page 13, line 4. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of §112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action states that claim 1 recites “a hardware controller...” which is vague and indefinite. By the foregoing amendments, claim 1 has been amended to address the rejection. Claims 3-5 have been canceled.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action states that the relationship of the program to the recited elements is unclear (See page 5, item 5). By the foregoing amendments, claim 6 has been amended according to the suggestion in the present Office Action, page 3, item 5, second paragraph. The Office Action also indicates confusing description and improper grammar of claim 6 (See page 4, item 7). By the foregoing amendments, claim 6 has been amended to address the indication.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office Action states that claim 8 may be read as a computer product claim. (See page 4, item 6). By the foregoing amendments, claim 8 has been amended to delete the language “for causing a computer to execute registration management concerning products”. The Office Action also indicates confusing description and improper grammar of claim 8 (See page 4, item 7). By the foregoing amendments, claim 8 has been amended to address the indication.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of §112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Office Action states that the Examiner interprets "hardware controller" to include software which controls hardware. By the foregoing amendments, claim 1 has been amended to change the term "a hardware controller" to the term --a processor--. Claims 2-5 have been canceled.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. By the foregoing amendments, claim 8 has been amended to claim a method tied to a computer including a first database that registers product IDs of products and a first memory that stores temporary registration condition information indicating IDs which are specified by at least one of a lot number of a product line for a product and a date of manufacture of a product.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of §101 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. (USP 5,864,755, hereinafter King).

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

As an example, independent claim 1 recites (among other things) features of:

a first memory that stores temporary registration condition information indicating IDs which are specified by at least one of a lot number of a product line for a product and a date of manufacture of a product;... and

an information updating section that updates the temporary registration condition information stored in the first memory based on the historical information stored in the second memory and the ID of the target product.

As will be explained below, at least these features of claim 1 provide distinctions over King.

According to the noted features of claim 1, the first memory stores temporary registration condition information. The temporary registration condition information indicates IDs which are specified by at least one of a lot number of a product line

for a product and a date of manufacture of a product. The information updating section updates the temporary registration condition information stored in the first memory based on historical information concerning temporary registration processing executed by the temporary registration section and an ID of a target product. The historical information is stored in a second memory by the historical information storage section.

In contrast, King merely discloses that “[i]n one embodiment of the present invention, the assignment between the DID and the unique identifying number is terminated after a predetermined period of time.” That is, a termination of assignment between the DID and unique identifying number does not imply any updating of the temporary registration condition information, which would have required that such assignment information to be initially stored, and then subsequently updated. However, as asserted in the Office Action on page 7, “dialing emergency service is interpreted as a [temporary registration] condition.” Hence, King would have to show that there is an updating of the “dialing emergency service” - not an updating of the assignment information that must be initially stored, and then subsequently updated to show a termination of such an assignment. Accordingly, King fails to disclose the above temporary registration condition information. Consequently, King fails to disclose the first memory and the information updating section.

Hence, the above-noted features of claim 1 provide distinctions over King. Among other things, a *prima facie* case of obviousness must establish that the asserted reference teaches or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention. In view of the distinctions of claim 1 noted above, at least one claimed element is not present in the reference. Hence, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness vis-à-vis claim 1.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 6

As an example, independent claim 6 recites (among other things) a feature of:

updating the temporary registration condition information stored in the first memory based on the historical information stored in the second memory and the ID of the target product.

According to the noted feature of claim 6, the temporary registration condition information stored in the first memory is updated based on the historical information concerning temporary registration processing executed by the temporary registration section and the ID of the target product. The temporary registration condition information indicates IDs which are specified by at least one of a lot number of a product line for a product and a date of manufacture of a product.

As similarly noted above with reference to claim 1, King fails to disclose the above temporary registration condition information. Consequently, King fails to disclose the updating of claim 6. Hence, the above-noted features of claim 6 provide distinctions over King. Among other things, a *prima facie* case of obviousness must establish that the asserted reference teaches or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention. In view of the distinctions of claim 6 noted above, at least one claimed element is not present in the reference. Hence, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness vis-à-vis claim 6.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 8

As an example, independent claim 8 recites (among other things) a feature of:

updating the temporary registration condition information stored in the first memory based on the historical information stored in the second memory and the ID of the target product.

According to the noted feature of claim 8, the temporary registration condition information stored in the first memory is updated based on the historical information concerning temporary registration processing executed by the temporary registration section and the ID of the target product. The temporary registration condition information indicates IDs which are specified by at least one of a lot number of a product line for a product and a date of manufacture of a product.

As similarly noted above with reference to claim 1, King fails to disclose the above temporary registration condition information. Consequently, King fails to disclose the updating of claim 8.

Hence, the above-noted features of claim 8 provide distinctions over King. Among other things, a *prima facie* case of obviousness must establish that the asserted reference teaches or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention. In view of the distinctions of claim 8 noted above, at least one claimed element is not present in the reference. Hence, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness vis-à-vis claim 8.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the rejection of claims 1, 6 and 8 is improper. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

Again, new claims 10-13 have been added. Distinguishing features of claim 1 have been noted above. As for new claims 10-13 not argued above, the following comments are provided.

New claims 10-13 ultimately depend from claim 1, respectively, and so at least similarly distinguish over King.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would assist in resolving any issues pertaining to the allowability of the above-identified application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please grant any required extensions of time and charge any fees due in connection with this request to deposit account no. 50-4610.

PATENT

Docket No.: 03-52273
App. Ser. No.: 10/786,102

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 6, 2009

By ./Tiep H. Nguyen/

Tiep H. Nguyen
Registration No.: 44,465
Phone: 202-285-9782

Fujitsu Patent Center
FUJITSU MGMT SERVICES OF AMERICA, INC.
PTO Customer No.: 79326